## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM**EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

|        | 110110 | DOCUME |
|--------|--------|--------|
| Page 1 | of 2   |        |

| Command:       | Valley | Chapter:   |
|----------------|--------|------------|
| Yuba-Sutter    |        | 8          |
| Inspected by:  | •      | Date:      |
| Sgt. S. Klocke | r      | 04/13/2010 |
|                |        |            |

| INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall the number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, co | Inspection docume                | on number. Under "Forwa<br>ent shall be utilized to doc | ard to:" enter the nex<br>ument innovative pra | ll in the blanks as indicated. Enter the chapter<br>tt level of command where the document<br>actices, suggestions for statewide<br>used if additional space is required.  |
|--|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command I   | Total hours expended inspection: | d on the  | Corrective Action Plan Included                |  |
| ☐ Executive Office Level   |                                  | 3 Hours   |  | Attachments Included   |
| Follow-up Required:  | Forwa                            | rd to: Valley Division                                  |  |  |
| ☐ Yes  | Due D                            | ate: 04/15/2010   |  |  |
| Chapter Inspection: 8-Comm   | and DI                           | JI Cost Recovery  | Me tryin i uz se                               | THE STATE OF |
| Inspector's Comments Regar   | ding Ir                          | nnovative Practices                                     | :  |  |
| NONE.  |                                  |   |  |  |
| Command Suggestions for S  | tatewic                          | de Improvement:   |  |  |
| NONE.  |                                  |   |  |  |
| Inspector's Findings:  |                                  |   |  |  |
| more than one activity? Durin recovery did not contain the bithe future.   | g inspe<br>llable [              | ection it was discov<br>DUI time. Steps ha              | ered the CHP <sup>∠</sup><br>ve been taken     | to preclude this from occurring in   |
| Commander's Response:  | Concu                            | ır or 🗌 Do Not Con                                      | cur (Do Not Conc                               | ur shall document basis for response)  |
|  |                                  |   |  |  |
| Inspector's Comments: Shall etc.)  | address                          | non concurrence by c                                    | ommander (e.g., fi                             | ndings revised, findings unchanged,  |

NONE.

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

| Command:        | Valley | Chapter:   |  |
|-----------------|--------|------------|--|
| Yuba-Sutter     |        | 8          |  |
| Inspected by:   |        | Date:      |  |
| Sgt. S. Klocker |        | 04/13/2010 |  |
|                 |        |            |  |

| Required Action                   |  |
|-----------------------------------|--|
| Corrective Action Plan/Timeline   |  |
| Corrective Action Flank Finneline |  |
|                                   |  |
|                                   |  |
|                                   |  |

NONE.

| Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer.  (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.) | COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE                   | 4/14/10        |
|--|---|----------------|
|  | INSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE  S. PLOCHR #10836 | U-14-10        |
| Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur  Do not concur   | REVIEWBR'S SIGNATURE                    | DATE: 06/22/10 |

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

#### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

| Command:<br>Yuba Sutter                      | Division:<br>Valley | Number:             |  |  |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| Evaluated by:<br>Sgt. S. Klocker, ID #10836  |                     | Date: 04/13/2010    |  |  |
| Assisted by:<br>Officer V. Martin, ID #15769 |                     | Date:<br>04/13/2010 |  |  |

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statutes, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

| TYPE OF INSPECTION   | Lead Inspector's Signature:   |
|--|---|
| ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level   | S. Klockel #10036   |
| ☐ Office of Inspections ☐ Voluntary Self-Inspection  |   |
| Follow-up Required:  | Commander's Signature: Date: 4/14/10  |
| For applicable policies, refer to HPM 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, Chapter 20.  |   |
| <b>Note:</b> A "Yes" response indicates full compliance with policy be utilized for explanation.   | If a "No" or "N/A" box is checked, the "Remarks" section shall  |
| Does the command have sufficient procedures to<br>ensure that a CHP 735, Incident Response<br>Reimbursement Statement, is prepared for each<br>arrest that meets the cost recovery criteria? |   |
| the corresponding CHP 415's for the investigating officer and and CHP 415's are checked for accuracy by both the court o   | r the criteria are met for completion. Attached to the CHP 735 is any personnel assisting with the investigation. The CHP 735 ificer and a supervisor to insure proper billing. |
| <ol><li>Does the command have a specific employee(s)<br/>assigned to process all CHP 735 forms?</li></ol>  | Yes No N/A Remarks: The court officer   |
| 4. If the answer to question 3 of this checklist is yes, is<br>the responsibility of processing all CHP 735 forms<br>listed in their job description or any other document?                  |   |

### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

| 5. Are all CHP 735 forms forwarded to Fiscal<br>Management Section (FMS) properly with completed<br>criteria in either Section A or Section B of the form?   | ⊠ Yes | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks:  |
|--|-------|------|-------|---|
| <ul> <li>6. Does the command have a suspense system in place to facilitate notification of a conviction involving cases meeting the requirements of the Driving Under the Influence (DUI) Cost Recovery Program? This would involve cases where the following criteria applies: <ul> <li>A Blood Alcohol Content (BAC) under .08%</li> <li>A chemical test is positive for drugs only</li> <li>There is no supporting BAC test of drug test (i.e., a refusal)</li> </ul> </li> </ul> | ⊠ Yes | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks: The court officer maintains the pending CHP 735's until the court case is adjudicated.                     |
| <ul> <li>7. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section A of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from one of the following dates?</li> <li>The date of BAC results of =.08% were received</li> <li>The date of BAC results of =.04% were received for a commercial driver</li> </ul>   | ⊠ Yes | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks: With the exception of an incomplete report exceeding the 10 days following the receipt of the BAC results. |
| <ul> <li>8. Are CHP 735 forms completed based on the criteria of Section B of the form being forwarded to FMS within ten business days from being notified of a conviction of California Vehicle Sections 23152 or 23153, or greater offence as a result of one of the following?</li> <li>The person arrested refused to provide a chemical test</li> <li>The arrest was for drugs only</li> <li>A BAC of &lt; .08% was obtained</li> </ul>   | ⊠ Yes | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:  |
| 9. Is the Itemized Staff Hours section of the CHP 735 completed as required in Highway Patrol Manual 11.1, Administrative Procedures Manual, and includes hours for all employees assigned to the incident?  | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks:  |
| 10. If the person arrested is transient, is the case being<br>entered into the CHP 735A, Case Log-DUI Cost<br>Recovery Program, without forwarding the CHP 735<br>to FMS?  | ⊠ Yes | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:  |
| 11. Are staff hours involved in the incident recorded on<br>the CHP 735 to the nearest ten minutes?  | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks:  |
| 12. Do the total number of staff hours charged on the<br>CHP 735 agree with the appropriate CHP 415, Daily<br>Field Record?  | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks:  |

3 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

| 13. Does the Notes portion of the CHP 415 indicate the billable DUI time when the CHP 415 includes more than one activity?   | ☐ Yes      | ⊠ No       | □ N/A    | Remarks: Future CHP 415's will comply with policy. |
|--|------------|------------|----------|--|
| <ul> <li>14. Are the staff hours incurred by members of the Department for the following activities associated with an incident meeting the criteria for DUI cost recovery included in the CHP 735?</li> <li>Response Time</li> <li>On-Scene Investigation</li> <li>Follow-up Investigation</li> <li>Report Writing</li> <li>Vehicle Storage</li> <li>Call Back</li> <li>Field Sobriety Testing</li> <li>Transportation</li> <li>Booking</li> <li>Chemical Testing</li> <li>Traffic Control</li> </ul> | ⊠ Yes      | □No        | □ N/A    | Remarks:   |
| 15. Are the staff hours for officers-in-charge, sergeants, lieutenants, or captains listed on the CHP 735 for time spent performing the activities listed in question 12 of this checklist and not exclusively supervisory tasks?  | ⊠ Yes      | □ No       | □ N/A    | Remarks:   |
| 16. Is the current hourly rate for reimbursement, sent out to all commands via Comm-Net from FMS, being used?  | ⊠ Yes      | □No        | □ N/A    | Remarks:   |
| 17. Is a copy of the CHP 735 being retained at the command and filed?  | ⊠ Yes      | □No        | □ N/A    | Remarks:   |
| 18. Is the command utilizing the optional CHP 735A to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program?  | ⊠ Yes      | □ No       | □ N/A    | Remarks:   |
| 19. In the absence of a CHP 735A, how is the command to  | acking the | DUI Cost I | Recovery | Program?   |
| <ul> <li>20. If the command is not utilizing the CHP 735A, does the command use a case monitoring system to track cases qualifying for the DUI Cost Recovery Program which includes all of the following information:</li> <li>Defendant Information?</li> </ul>   | ☐ Yes      | ☐ No       | ⊠ N/A    | Remarks:   |

### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND DUI COST RECOVERY

| <ul> <li>Violation Information?</li> <li>Court Information?</li> <li>FMS Information?</li> <li>BAC test results?</li> </ul>   |       |      |       |          |
|---|-------|------|-------|----------|
| 21. Are cases not resulting in a conviction within 12 months after submission to the District Attorney closed out after court verification of case status?  | ⊠ Yes | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| 22. Do closed out cases on the monitoring system have a line drawn through the Conviction Date and Date to FMS as well as the reason the case was closed and date of last follow-up check?                                    | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| 23. Does the command reconcile their CHP 735 documentation so that the Department will not have to make any refund as result of overpayment or erroneous charges?   | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| 24. Is the command reviewing the quarterly reports sent by FMS related to the submission of CHP 735 forms and case status identifying any deficiencies in the submission and accountability of the DUI Cost Recovery Program? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks: |
| Question 25 pertains to Fiscal Management Section.  |       |      |       |          |
| 25. Is FMS reviewing the CHP 735 forms for completeness of information and returning deficient forms to the issuing command for corrections?  | ☐ Yes | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: |

# **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

| Page 1 | of 2 |
|--------|------|
|--------|------|

| Command:        | Valley | Chapter:   |
|-----------------|--------|------------|
| Yuba-Sutter     | 0      | 8          |
| Inspected by:   |        | Date:      |
| Sgt. S. Klocker |        | 04/13/2010 |
| - 3             |        |            |

| INSTRUCTIONS: This document shall be number of the inspection in the Chapter shall be routed to and its due date. This improvement, identified deficiencies, cor | Inspection docume | on number. Under "Forwa<br>ent shall be utilized to doc | ard to:" enter the nex<br>ument innovative pra |  |  |  |  |
|--|-------------------|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| TYPE OF INSPECTION  ☐ Division Level ☐ Command Level ☐ Executive Office Level  |                   | Total hours expended on the inspection:  2 Hours        |  | ☐ Corrective Action Plan Included ☐ Attachments Included |  |  |  |
| Follow-up Required: ☐ Yes   ☑ No   |                   | rd to: Valley Division<br>ate: 04/15/2010               |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chapter Inspection: 8-Command Reimbursable Services  Inspector's Comments Regarding Innovative Practices:  NONE.   |                   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Command Suggestions for Sinone.  | tatewic           | de Improvement:   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Inspector's Findings:  The Yuba-Sutter Area's Findings:  |                   | •   | ogram is being                                 | managed in compliance with                               |  |  |  |
| Commander's Response: 🗵  | Concu             | ır or □ Do Not Cor                                      | cur (Do Not Conc                               | cur shall document basis for response)                   |  |  |  |
| Inspector's Comments: Shall etc.)  NONE.   | address           | non concurrence by c                                    | ommander (e.g., fi                             | indings revised, findings unchanged,                     |  |  |  |
| Required Action  Corrective Action Plan/Timeli   | ne                |   | an Fig.  |  |  |  |  |

NONE.

## **COMMAND INSPECTION PROGRAM** EXCEPTIONS DOCUMENT

Page 2 of 2

| Chapter:   |
|------------|
| 8          |
| Date:      |
| 04/13/2010 |
|            |

| Employee would like to discuss this report with the reviewer. (See HPM 9.1, Chapter 8 for appeal procedures.) | COMMANDER'S SIGNATURE        | DATE 4/14/10 |
|---|------------------------------|--------------|
|   | NSPECTOR'S SIGNATURE # 10836 | 4-14-10      |
| Reviewer discussed this report with employee Concur  Do not concur  | REVIEWER'S SIGNATURE         | DATE         |

1 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

| Command:<br>Yuba Sutter           | Division:<br>Valley | Number: |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|---------|
| Evaluated by:<br>Sgt. S. Klocker, | Date: 04/13/2010    |         |
| Assisted by:                      |                     | Date:   |

INSTRUCTIONS: Answer individual items with "Yes" or "No" answers, or fill in the blanks as indicated. Any "No" answers, discrepancies with policy, applicable legal statutes, or deficiencies noted in the inspections shall be commented on via the "Remarks" section. Additionally, such discrepancies and/or deficiencies shall be documented on an Exceptions Document and addressed to the next level of command. Furthermore, the memorandum shall include any follow-up and/or corrective action(s) taken. If this form is used as a Follow-up Inspection, the "Follow-up Inspection" box shall be marked and only deficient items need to be re-inspected.

| TYPE OF INSPECTION  |                        |                   | Lead Inspector's Signature: |           |              |                     |
|---|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|-----------|--------------|---------------------|
| ☐ Division Level ☐ Com  | mand Level             |                   | )                           |           | $\bigcirc$   |                     |
| Biviolon 20vel  | mana Eovoi             | J. KLOCKE # 10886 |                             |           |              | 08/0                |
|   | tary Self-Inspection   |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
|   | llow-Up Inspection     | Commande          | er's Signature:             |           |              | Date:               |
| │   |                        | 1                 | RI                          | 4         |              | 4/14/10             |
|   |                        | 1                 | 70                          |           |              | 1111710             |
| For applicable policies, refer to HPM   | 11.1, Chapter 6.       |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
|   |                        |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| Note: A "Yes" response indicates full com   | poliance with policy I | f a "No" or       | "N/A" box i                 | s checked | the "Rem     | arks" section shall |
| be utilized for explanation.  | ipilarioo war policy:  |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| Prior to the performance of service   |                        |                   |                             |           | Describes    |                     |
| contracting party informed of the   |                        |                   | ☐ No                        | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| services, departmental equipmen   | t usage, and           |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| cancellation policy?  2. Does the billing rate include miles                                  | ago and other          |                   | -                           |           |              |                     |
| expenses such as uniform or equ   |                        | ⊠ Yes             | □No                         | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| When a safety service is provided   |                        |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| agency, is the agency's five-digit  |                        |                   | □No                         | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| obtained?   |                        |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| 4. Is the billing code documented on  | the Reimbursable       | N V               |                             |           | Remarks:     |                     |
| Services Billing Memorandum?  5. Is \$50 charged for each CHP unif                            | arm ad amplayas        |                   | □ No                        | □ N/A     | 7.0          |                     |
| <ol><li>Is \$50 charged for each CHP unif<br/>assigned to the detail if the cance</li></ol>   |                        | ⊠ Yes             | □No                         | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| less than 24 hours prior to the sch   |                        | <u> </u>          |                             |           |              |                     |
| 6. Is a minimum payment of 4 hours  |                        |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| when employee(s) could not be n   | otified of the         |                   | ☐ No                        | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| cancellation of their service(s)?   |                        |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| 7. Is information regarding the proce   |                        | ⊠ Yes             | □ No                        | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| necessary right-of-way clearance:<br>requirements, and other pertinent                        |                        | M res             | □ 140                       |           |              |                     |
| available to inquiring parties?   | imormation made        |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| Are written requests for specific s   | ervices directed to    |                   |                             |           |              |                     |
| the appropriate command?  |                        |                   | ☐ No                        | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| 9. Are traffic control services less that   | an \$50,000            | <b>5</b> 4        |                             |           | Remarks:     |                     |
| approved by Division?   | tod to be 000 000      |                   | ☐ No                        | □ N/A     | . torriants. |                     |
| <ol> <li>Are traffic control services estima<br/>more approved by the Office of th</li> </ol> |                        | ⊠ Yes             | □No                         | □ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |
| 11. Are extraordinary protective service  |                        | ZZ 163            |                             | 14//      |              |                     |
| Assistant Commissioner, Field?  | %                      | ☐ Yes             | ☐ No                        | ⊠ N/A     | Remarks:     |                     |

#### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

CHAPTER 8
COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

| Questions 12 through 17 pertain to collecting advance deposits.  |         |      |       |  |  |  |  |
|--|---------|------|-------|--|--|--|--|
| 12. Is a Reimbursable Services Agreement (RSA) log<br>number requested from Division for every contract?   | ⊠ Yes   | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 13. Is a CHP 465 form completed in accordance with policy?   |         | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 14. Are advance payments collected from the contracting company prior to the start of the service?   | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 15. Is a CHP 251 prepared and mailed to the contracting company upon receipt of advance payments?  | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 16. Is a CHP 467 prepared and submitted to the Fiscal<br>Management Section upon completion of the<br>contractual service(s)?  | ⊠ Yes   | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 17. Is a copy of the CHP 465 attached to the weekly CHP 230, and if applicable, a CHP 169?   |         | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| Questions 18 through 31 pertain to the preparation of agree  | ements. |      |       |  |  |  |  |
| 18. Is a CHP 466 maintained?   | ☐ Yes   | ☐ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Division Coordinator maintains log. |  |  |  |
| 19. Do RSA numbers begin with the letter "R" to denote reimbursable services, followed by two digit fiscal year, three digit location code, and a sequential number for each agreement?        | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 20. Is the CHP 466 closed out at the end of each fiscal year with a new log implemented on July 1 beginning with the sequential number 001?  | ☐ Yes   | □No  | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Division maintains                  |  |  |  |
| 21. Are all sequential numbers accounted for when reconciling with the Billing Memorandum?   | ☐ Yes   | □No  | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Division maintains                  |  |  |  |
| 22. Are sequential numbers not matching Billing<br>Memorandums reconciled?   | ☐ Yes   | □No  | ⊠ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 23. Is the original RSA signed and filed at Area?  |         | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 24. Does the command proceed with all RSA arrangements, and if needed, ensure the requestor has obtained the necessary right-of-way, clearances, and permits?                                  | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 25. Is the indemnification clause included in the agreement when requested?  | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 26. Is the inclusion of the indemnification clause approved by the Department of General Services, Office of Legal Services?   | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 27. If the service is over \$50,000 per occasion, is a CHP 78R prepared and submitted to Contract Services Unit?   | ⊠ Yes   | □No  | □ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 28. Is a copy of the resolution, order, motion, or ordinance of the local governing body obtained when one of the contracting parties is a county, city, district, or other local public body? | ☐ Yes   | □ No | ⊠ N/A | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |
| 29. Are dignitary protection services referred to the Office   |         |      |       | Remarks:                                     |  |  |  |

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

**CHAPTER 8** 

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

|       | of Dignitary Protection?   | ⊠ Yes      | ☐ No        | □ N/A      |   |
|-------|--|------------|-------------|------------|---|
| 30    | . Are CHP 312 forms, CHP 313 forms, and CHP 467<br>forms prepared when a statewide agreement is in<br>effect?  | ☐ Yes      | □No         | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: Not an Area command responsibility.                          |
| 31    | . When state agencies are requesting a statewide agreement, are they referred to Enforcement Services Division, Field Support Section?   | ⊠ Yes      | ☐ No        | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
| Quest | ions 32 through 37 pertain to training agreement pro   | cedures a  | ind reporti | ng for se  | rvices provided.  |
| 32    | Are the original CHP 467 and contract agreement submitted to Fiscal Management Section (FMS) upon completion of services (other than COZEEP, MAZEEP, extraordinary protective services, and special projects) within 5 days? | ☐ Yes      | □No         | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: * Several questions are 'N/A' for the Area inspection.       |
| 33    | . Are copies of CHP 467 forms forwarded to the next level of review?   | ☐ Yes      | □No         | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: *  |
| 34.   | Is the date when the Billing Memorandum was sent to FMS noted on the Reimbursable Services Control Log?  | ☐ Yes      | □ No        | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: *  |
| 35.   | Is a copy of the command's Reimbursable Services Control Log forwarded or e-mailed to the Division Coordinator at the end of each month?   | ☐ Yes      | ⊠ No        | □ N/A      | Remarks: Valley Division coordinator maintains the log for all Areas. |
| 36.   | Is the Reimbursable Services Control Log verified with the copies of the Billing Memorandums to ensure all reimbursable time has been reported to FMS for billing purposes?  | ☐ Yes      | □No         | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: *  |
|       | Are outstanding items being inspected and resolved?  | ☐ Yes      | ☐ No        | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: *  |
|       | ons 38 through 51 pertain to extraordinary protectiv<br>I projects.  | e services | and repo    | rt of over | time hours for reimbursable   |
|       | Is a copy of the CHP 467 and CHP 465 submitted to FMS upon completion of extraordinary protective services?  | ☐ Yes      | □No         | ⊠ N/A      | Remarks: This is not within the scope of an Area inspection.          |
|       | Is a reimbursable special project code obtained on every contractual service?  | ⊠ Yes      | □No         | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
| 40.   | Is the overtime report(s) for reimbursable special project(s) used to reconcile CHP 415 forms for each special project?  | ⊠ Yes      | □ No        | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
| 41.   | Are the special project codes on the overtime report(s) verified to ensure the correct special project code has been used?   | ⊠ Yes      | □ No        | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
| 42.   | Are all corrections noted on the overtime report(s)?   |            | ☐ No        | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
|       | Are overtime reports approved and dated by the commander after reconciling?  | ⊠ Yes      | □No         | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
|       | Is the original overtime report(s) forwarded to FMS?   |            | □No         | □ N/A      | Remarks: By Division  |
|       | Is a copy of the overtime report forwarded to Division by the 10 <sup>th</sup> of the month (except COZEEP/MAZEEP)?  Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports forwarded to  |            | □No         | □ N/A      | Remarks:  |
| 40.   | ALE ALL COZECT/MAZEET REPORTS TORWARDED TO   |            | 1           | 1          | I   |

4 of 4

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF CALIFORNIA HIGHWAY PATROL

### **INSPECTION PROGRAM**

**CHAPTER 8** 

COMMAND REIMBURSABLE SERVICES

| Division by the 15 <sup>th</sup> of the month?  |       | ☐ No | □ N/A | Remarks:   |
|---|-------|------|-------|--|
| 47. Are all COZEEP/MAZEEP reports approved by Division and forwarded to FMS by the 30 <sup>th</sup> of the month?                         | ☐ Yes | □No  | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: This is not within the scope of an Area inspection.                     |
| 48. Is a copy of the CHP 71 attached to the overtime report(s) when there are reimbursable nonuniformed personnel hours?                  | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks:   |
| 49. Is an amendment of service agreement requested<br>prior to the fund being depleted, and if necessary, is<br>the service discontinued? | ⊠ Yes | □ No | □ N/A | Remarks:   |
| 50. Are all payments made directly to FMS?  | ☐ Yes | □No  | ⊠ N/A | Remarks:   |
| 51. Does the command require delinquent companies to<br>pay outstanding invoices in full prior to providing any<br>future services?       | ☐ Yes | □No  | ⊠ N/A | Remarks: Current procedures require a full deposit before services are provided. |